

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

PUBLIC LIBRARY

JUL 1 1943

Volume III, No. 11

JUNE 28, 1943

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

The Pattern of a Coming Loyalty

THE coordination by the United Nations of their war efforts has already brought assurance of ultimate victory. It is no longer a question whether they will win the War. The only questions are when and how decisively they will win it. The coordination by these same nations of their food production and distribution is second in importance only to the winning of the War. The President is warranted in describing the agreements reached at the United Nations Food Conference as marking an epoch in the history of mankind. Never before in human history has there been so bright a hope and so definite a promise that the resources of the earth are to be made available for subsistence not merely for the privileged few but for the human race in its entirety.

There is another field in which the possibilities created by the association of nations representing nearly all the races and languages in the world still wait to be explored. Man conquers but does not build by the sword; he does not live by bread alone; he lives chiefly in personal relationships and in community-building traditions. If the United Nations are to make their coordinated efforts basic for a new world order, they must share more than munitions and food. They must share their cultural traditions. The sharing of such traditions is a prerequisite to the kind of loyalty which a new world order will require, a loyalty sufficiently realistic to start with things as they are—the given facts of blood and race and soil—while at the same time sufficiently magnanimous to integrate these age-old partial loyalties into something more complete; so making them complementary instead of contradictory, and unitive instead of divisive.

A good beginning can be made by using the resources of the radio, the motion-picture, the school-room, the press, the pulpit, and even philately—how many of us owe our first appreciation of the rest of the world to juvenile stamp collecting—to evaluate and publicize the different cultural traditions brought to this country by immigrants from all parts of the

world. Foremost among these traditions is of course the English. By the fortunes of history we derive from them our speech, our common law, the major part of our literature, and in large part our religion. The sharing of the Anglo-Saxon tradition unlocks for us doors of sympathy with the nations and their dependencies which share it with us, and which together with us constitute the English-speaking world. Australia, Canada and Newfoundland, Great Britain, New Zealand and South Africa, are linguistically our kinsmen. What perhaps is more important, they are politically our kinsmen. Magna Carta is generally recognized as the foundation of the written and unwritten constitutions which guarantee the ordered liberty of all the English-speaking nations. Magna Carta Day might well be made the symbol of the spiritual solidarity of the "Seven Nations," and be commemorated annually by appropriate religious services and secular celebrations.

Linguistically we are numbered among the seven nations of the English-speaking world. Geographically we are numbered among the twenty-one republics which constitute the Western Hemisphere. The Monroe Doctrine has now happily developed into a Good Neighbor policy which enables the American republics to deal with one another on a plane of liberty and equality. Much remains to be done before they can meet upon a plane of thoroughgoing fraternity, with mutual appreciation of their disparate cultural traditions. The best approach is biographical. In an oration on The Weal of Nations, Horace Bushnell truly said that the wealth of a nation is in the breasts of its sons. All South America knows and reverences the name of George Washington. We in North America do not yet know as much as we should about South American liberators. Commemoration of the birthday of Simon Bolivar would assist us to such knowledge. Since it was during his visit to the United States in 1809 that Bolivar acquired his enthusiasm for republican institutions, his is *par excellence* the name to symbolize the solidarity of the Americans of two conti-

nents. A name equally honored in South America is that of General José de San Martín of Argentina. By his liberation of Argentina, Chile and Peru, but most of all by his nobility of character, his freedom from personal ambition and the complete disinterestedness of his public service, he ranks among the illustrious patriots of all time. As for Toussaint l'Ouverture, liberator of Haiti, his name is redolent of high romance, and one of the greatest of American poets, Edwin Arlington Robinson, has already immortalized it in his poem "Napoleon in Hell." Toussaint in his moral and intellectual greatness shows the heights to which the full-blooded Negro may aspire, and commands a loyalty which transcends racial prejudice.

But these linguistic and hemispheric loyalties are still only partial loyalties, and they may still be divisive, if they are not transcended by sympathies which are global in scope. Neither the American republics nor the English-speaking Commonwealth of Nations have a monopoly of the love of liberty or of the political institutions in which liberty is embodied and by which human rights are made secure. The Hebrew prophets antedated the Barons of Runnymede by two milleniums, and they knew more than did the barons of the basis of human rights in the moral law. The Greeks who originated democratic institutions did so most imperfectly, but they did so first, and civilization would beggar itself if it tried to discharge its obligation to the tradition of Greek culture. Switzerland is not Anglo-Saxon, but it is by centuries the oldest and in some respects the most successful republic in the world. Jeanne d'Arc did not speak English and was not a Protestant, but she remains the radiant symbol of the glory that was and will again be France. During June the Norwegians have been celebrating the anniversary of their independence, and in their homeland they are giving glowing evidence of their inherent right to it. During June the Yugoslavs have been celebrating the anniversary of the Battle of Kosovo, that defeat in arms which was more glorious than victory since it gave Europe a breathing space in which to prepare to resist successfully the Moslem invasion. History repeats itself, and in the Balkan mountains the Serbs of today are again bearing sacrificial witness to Kosovo's glory. Czechoslovaks the world over are preparing to commemorate again this summer the Bohemian martyr, John Huss. Holland is reminding us that a Hollander, Hugo de Groot (Grotius), was the founder of international law, and that the world's juridical centre is properly located in *s'Gravenhage* (The Hague).

All these and all similar cultural traditions are ours if we wish, shared in virtue of our membership in the United Nations. Americanization does not mean obliterating them and condemning them to oblivion. Americanization means the integration into the American tradition of what peoples of many races and languages, Chinese and Russian as well as other allies, have brought to our receptive shores. Every American should be able to make his own the brave sentence of Terence, *Homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum puto*. Wave upon wave of immigration has brought us strong bodies to subdue the American wilderness and great recollections and traditions to enrich the American soul, and by appropriating them we shall be weaving for ourselves and for the world the pattern of global loyalty out of which is to come at long last the City of Human Brotherhood.

H. C. R.

The Refugee Question

No problem is more harassing to the Christian conscience than the plight of refugees, especially those of the Jewish race. There is no difference as to the magnitude and horror of the facts. There are the widest differences, for example among the editors and sponsors of *Christianity and Crisis*, as to steps which can and should be taken. We are glad to publish Dr. Atkinson's moving appeal in an adjoining column. In subsequent issues, we shall welcome alternative proposals of courses to which Christians may lend support.

H. P. V. D.

Authors in This Issue

Henry A. Atkinson is General Secretary of the Church Peace Union.

Dr. Niebuhr writes from Great Britain where he is spending two months in speaking and conferences with British church leaders. We learn that he is to be given the honorary degree of Doctor of Divinity by Oxford University on July 1st.

Arthur Hays Sulzberger is President and Publisher of the New York Times.

Francis B. Sayre is Special Assistant to the Secretary of State, and former High Commissioner to the Philippines.

Joseph H. Ball is a United States Senator from Minnesota.

Thomas E. Dewey is the Governor of New York.

"The Jewish Problem" Is a Christian Problem

HENRY A. ATKINSON

CHRISTIAN ministers and laymen are painfully aware of the plight of the Jews and have decided to do something about it.

Not satisfied with pious resolutions of condolence, they realize that "being sorry" is not enough and a Day of Compassion does not suffice. Confessions of guilt and professions of contrition can be empty gestures; unless, and until, they are followed by concrete action.

The Christian conscience cannot rest content in expressions of goodwill and pious intentions but must be translated into a definite program of action. It is the conviction, therefore, of an increasing number of Christian leaders, that, in the present crisis, Palestine should be made accessible to Jewish refugees from lands of persecution. To this end we have formed the "Christian Council on Palestine" to which more than seven hundred ministers and laymen now belong.

As Dr. James G. McDonald, formerly League of Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, has pointed out, the time for discussion is past. The Jews of Europe, he notes, "live in an abyss of misery—human, economic and social—which only prompt international effort on the largest and most generously conceived scale would even partially alleviate."

The failure of the Bermuda Conference to develop a constructive program to help these millions of helpless Jews is a shocking scandal no less shameful than the ineptness and spiritual bankruptcy of the Evian Conference. The ghost of political expediency and appeasement hovered about Bermuda, and, while diplomats delayed, thousands more of hapless Jews were killed each day in Eastern and Central Europe! Torture and persecution and ultimate extermination are the result for this unhappy people.

If anyone doubts the truth of these tales of horror and incredibly savage slaughter, then let him turn to the scholarly study of "The Mass Murder of Jews in Europe" published in April by the *Information Service* of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America. Since war began in 1939, two to three million Jews have been relentlessly hounded to death. The remaining four to five million in Europe today are doomed as the victims of an avowed policy of extermination. These mass killings are not the "atrocities stories" of the hysterical propagandist. They are grim facts as horrible as they are true.

A minimal standard of justice would demand a place in this world where these gifted, but hunted

people, may enjoy the privilege of living a normal, free, self-respecting life of its own.

We anticipate, of course, the triumph of United Nations' armies and of political democracy in Europe, as well as the ultimate establishment there of a social structure in consonance with a basic Christian ethic so that it will be possible for Jews, as well as for all others, to live in dignity and freedom. Nevertheless, we must be realistic enough to know that great difficulties stand in the way of rehabilitating Jews in Central and Western Europe. Anti-Semitism has been too long endemic in this part of the world to be routed out so quickly. The poison of Hitlerism will not be quickly purged from the body politic. Unfortunately, the noxious doctrines of the "Master Race" have done their work too well.

The usual answer which well-meaning people give to this question is: "Solve the minorities problem—and you solve the problem of the Jews." Quite true. But just when do we solve it? What of the meantime? Shall we condemn hundreds of thousands—eventually millions—to the murderous hands of Hitler's henchmen?

"Grant equal rights to everyone at the conclusion of the war" is another glib retort. That was done at the end of the first World War and of what avail? It did little for the Jews in such countries as Roumania and Poland. Unless much more is done, and at once, there will be little improvement in granting equal rights and achieving them when the war ends. The hunger and poverty, devastation and stress of present day Europe will contribute little to the eradication of anti-Semitism.

The democracies are able to handle this problem adequately in the future, but a thin trickle of immigrants to North and South America now is not the answer. Ideally, we wish that our own nation, Canada, Mexico and every European country would permit the settlement of Jews and grant them a chance to live in freedom from fear and want. Realistically, however, we know that this will not be done. Our immediate concern is what to do *in the meantime*, especially in the face of the Nazis' sworn policy to make the fate of the Jews nothing less than complete extermination.

Palestine—A Haven of Refuge

Suggestions that the Jewish refugees be sent to Madagascar, Guiana, Africa, the West Indies, and South America are well taken; but there is the great barrier of distance, climate, and political opposition. Palestine is the only feasible solution to offer an

immediate haven of refuge in this desperate emergency. The only alternative is death.

Since no other country will throw open its doors, we must look to Palestine, and we believe this little country can be the haven of refuge for the millions of homeless Jews in Axis-occupied countries. It would not only be feasible to house them there but profitable as well. Britain is wrong in assuming that Palestine is simply her colonial problem. It is a world issue, and can be settled only by joint action of the United Nations.

The physical possibilities of Palestine are great, as pointed out by Dr. Walter Lowdermilk, Assistant Chief of Soil Reclamation for the United States Department of Agriculture, and former agricultural advisor to Generalissimo Chiang-Kai-Shek. Palestine can absorb four million Jews and, by programs of reclamation and irrigation, the inhabitants may thrive successfully upon the land.

We ask that the bars of immigration be lowered and that the homeless Jews of Europe be given a place of refuge. This is the greatest need of our tragic era. Palestine, as a homeland for the Jew, is our answer to a "Christian problem," for only in so-called Christian countries does anti-Semitism exist and create this tragic situation.

The Jews have an ancient moral claim to Palestine and have never relinquished it in all their history. This claim has been officially recognized and sanctioned by the Balfour Declaration, the Treaty of San Remo, and by statements of confirmation by various governments, including our own.

Rights of Arabs in Palestine

The rights of Arabs in Palestine must, of course, be fully recognized. Let that be completely and fully understood. The Arabs should be accorded every

possible guarantee to participate freely in the political life of the land and should be granted full cultural and social autonomy. It is well to remember that the Arab has ample opportunity for self-determination in many lands, but that the Jewish people have no such hope except in Palestine.

Jewish immigration in Palestine, during the last quarter of a century, has granted unnumberable social, economic, cultural and hygienic benefits to the Arabs. The continuance of this immigration, especially through the influx of refugees from war-torn Europe, will not only increase the potential resources of the land but will benefit both Jew and Arab alike.

The willingness of Jewish leaders to meet the issue of the Jew and the Arab presents an opportunity for wise and sympathetic statesmanship. Competent authors have made it clear that Arabs and Jews can and do get along well, especially if legitimate points of friction are eased and fascist *agents provocateurs* are routed out. We believe in an international mandate for Palestine to administer the Commonwealth. We suggest that a capable and competent international Christian Commission be sent to Palestine to study and analyze the problems of Jew and Arab, and offer concrete solutions.

This is not a "Protestant Zionism." It is something far greater. It is an attempt to answer what is basically not a Jewish problem, but rather a Christian problem.

The Christian Council on Palestine is a specific project in the larger framework of our efforts to win the peace while we are winning the war, a part of the whole process of preserving and extending democracy. At the very least this is to fulfill the obligations laid upon us by the imperatives of our Christian faith.

The Editor's Report on Britain

EDINBURGH, MAY 24.

I have not been in Britain long enough to make a significant report on the state of the nation. But having just concluded a visit of a week to the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, and having also had the pleasure of meeting with quite a number of the religious leaders in England, I may perhaps allow myself a preliminary report.

The General Assembly is always a great occasion in Scotland, and the stately opening of the Assembly by the Lord High Commissioner is an event. The High Commissioner this year is the Duke of Montrose, who yesterday appeared in state in the morning session and in the afternoon sat on the floor of the house as elder of his Presbytery, taking part in the debate on church extension.

Americans will be particularly interested in the Moderator of the Assembly this year, for it is none other than our "own" Professor Baillie now of Edinburgh University and formerly of Union Theological Seminary. Professor Baillie's leadership in the various fields in the Church has made this recognition of his distinguished services very natural. He was and still is the chairman of the important commission of the Church on "The Interpretation of God's Will in our Time." We published significant sections of the report of this commission in *Christianity and Crisis* this year. It has made a supplemental report this year and the Church of Scotland looks to it for leadership in guiding the Church in thought and action in difficult social, religious and international problems of the day.

Incidentally, I hope the Presbyterians of the U. S. A.

won't resent the suggestion of an outsider. It is that the election, or rather the nomination, of the Moderator through a special committee composed of the ex-moderators and representatives of each Presbytery obviates election campaigns which are not always dignified. Yet I believe that method manages to express the will of the Church in essentially democratic terms.

One interesting development in the Church of Scotland during the past year is the appointment of over seventy chaplains for the great industrial plants who are seeking to render services to the workers comparable to those of army chaplains. This seems to me a significant departure and one of great promise if chaplains can be found who can transcend the conventional in dealing with the workers.

The reports made by various chaplains to the Assembly also reveal how vital the service of the Church in the army is. I have the impression that the commanding officers are on the whole more vitally concerned with the religious life of the soldiers than most of our officers, but that is a generalization for which I really have insufficient evidence. Last night I had the opportunity of speaking to the Assembly together with Andre Phillip, who is Minister of Labor in the DeGaulle government and with a young chaplain from Malta, who gave a most inspiring account of the services rendered by the Scottish Kirk in Malta.

I have yet to make my longer visit to England. But I have been in London long enough to note that the religious life of the nation has been stirred in many ways. For one thing the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury is of quite a new order; and one sees evidences on every hand that he has inspired both the younger clergy and many of the laymen to bring the Christian faith into effective relation with all the vexing social and international issues of the day. In dealing with these issues the churches of England go much farther than our own in their concern for domestic problems. Their post-war pronouncement places primary emphasis upon domestic issues, whereas ours are concerned primarily with international ones.

Dr. Oldham's "Christian Frontier" is attempting in a new way what Dr. Oldham has always done so effectively, and that is to bring the best lay leadership in various realms of government and industry into vital relation with the Church. He thinks of it primarily as a lay movement. Dr. Oldham has one thing in common with the Oxford Group and that is that he is always searching for "key" men. The difference is that Dr. Oldham's "key" men are chosen with great discrimination and usually possess both Christian devotion and expert knowledge in a special field.

I hope that I may be able to report more adequately on the significance of the "Religion and Life" movement after I have had the opportunity of participating in some of its meetings in Newcastle.

Perhaps a word about the general situation would be appropriate in conclusion. The victories in Africa have of course tremendously cheered everyone over here, as they undoubtedly have back home. The tonic effect of these victories, together with the long summer

evenings (double summer time) which practically eliminate the vexations of the blackout, so depressing in wintertime, give the whole nation a tone of optimism and good cheer. No one expects a quick conclusion of the war. But everyone is certain of ultimate victory. That is quite a change from the dark days when the people of Britain held on grimly to some kind of desperate hope without having much justification for this hope in the actual situation.

LONDON, JUNE 3.

A comparison between the temper of British and American life leads to the conclusion that the great catastrophes of history have their moral uses. No one would want to invite the kind of bombing which has devastated many of the cities of Britain: but it cannot be denied that this havoc, together with the life and death struggle in which Britain has been engaged, has sobered the nation in a way in which our nation has not been sobered. The determination to reconstruct British society, the hope of building a better future have gripped the nation from top to bottom.

This general mood of repentance naturally expresses itself strongly in the religious community. I doubt whether the religious life of Britain has been more robust in many generations. The fortunate selection of Dr. Temple as Archbishop of Canterbury is both a symbol and a very good vehicle for the expression of new religious vitality in the Church of England. It is a symbol, because one may question whether, despite his great eminence as a theologian and church leader, he would have been chosen, had the time of the selection not corresponded with the darkest hours of British history. Since then his leadership has given expression to the new life. The enthusiasm which his effort to relate the Church to vexing social issues of the day has aroused among both people and clergy is very marked. One hears of dissidents of course. There are those who would like to see the Church relegated to its "proper sphere." The same people might damn it tomorrow for having become irrelevant to the life of the people.

The Archbishop has just introduced a measure in the convocation of Canterbury, encouraging an exchange of pulpits between the established and the free churches. The bishops passed it almost unanimously. The lower house almost defeated it and tried to limit the exchange to special, rather than regular liturgical services. I confess that the debate in the lower house left me with the impression that the Church can be unbelievably picayune in exemplifying the spirit of brotherhood, even while it speaks expansively of the task of teaching brotherhood to the nations. But at any rate this new step has been taken.

The "Religion and Life" movement continues in full swing. It is not unlike our Preaching Mission of some years ago. City after city is visited by a team of religious leaders. I shall have the opportunity of participating in such a week of effort in Newcastle next week.

Dr. Oldham who holds a very peculiar position in British religious life, difficult to describe to those who have not come in contact with it, has launched the

"Christian Frontier," a movement to engage Christian laymen in working out the problems of our modern society from the Christian point of view. This is not a mass movement. It seeks rather to engage leading laymen in conference and study upon the great economic and international issues. The "Christian Frontier" has taken over *The Christian News-Letter*, well known to many of our readers.

Last week I had the opportunity to speak to a large group of Cambridge undergraduates under the auspices of the Christian Student Movement. The college life in Britain held up much longer than our own because the army allowed every 18-year-old to have one year of college before inducting him. There will be little liberal arts education after this June, but it lasted three years longer under war conditions than among us. I found the audience of undergraduates (about 250 of them despite the beginning of examinations the next morning) keenly interested and full of intelligent questions. The problem of the relation of Christianity to Marxism is a much more live issue among them than among us, partly because the Russian alliance is felt to be much more intimate than our experience of it. I expect to speak at Oxford University next week.

War tactics have also influenced Christian technique. Recently a "Christian Commando" organization was created among the more evangelistic churches. They have emphasized street preaching and preaching out of season as well as in season. Open air preaching, incidentally, has a wider vogue than among us. I found one minister who has an outdoor service for the passerby every Sunday evening and attracts some 800 people Sunday nights.

On the vexing issues of the international order after the war, British Christians are less inclined than we are to spin ideal plans. Many significant groups are studying the issues. On the whole they hope for a reconstruction upon the "United Nations" pattern rather than upon the basis of some League of Nations. They believe that the primary condition of world order is a partnership between ourselves and them in the first place and between us and the Russians in the second. They are of course full of questions about America's probable attitude after the war and their questions are not without a note of apprehension. One reason why they are afraid of abstract solutions is that they think that American idealists might present them with an ideal solution while American realists prepare for a disavowal of all solutions. In other words they fear a repetition of the 1918 history.

One wishes it were possible to "split the difference" between the idealist and the realist school of world politics which is not quite identical with the American and the British school. One has the fear that, while abstract solutions would prove abortive, there are not at the moment in either Britain or America sufficiently large ideas and sufficiently inclusive plans for the post-war world. Many of the immediate problems of partnership which are diligently discussed can be solved only on the presupposition of a more generous over-all solution than is now envisaged.

R. NIEBUHR.

Six Pillars of Peace

EDITOR'S NOTE: *We continue the series of commentaries by distinguished leaders of national thought upon the "Political Propositions" recently set forth by the Federal Council's Commission on a Just and Durable Peace.*

The Third Pillar

ARTHUR HAYS SULZBERGER

The peace must make provision for an organization to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing underlying conditions.

Change is an invariable law of nature. Nothing that lives is static. If we are to achieve the functioning, effective peace called for by the Federal Council of Churches then—in the language of the Council—we must provide the means periodically to adapt the treaty structure of the world to changing conditions.

Such provision is advisable as an act of common sense and self-protection. No one can foresee the future. Nor can we as a nation claim any great genius for anticipating events. We have never gone into war prepared. We have not even been able always to distinguish between our friends and our enemies. Often, in the past one hundred and fifty years, events beyond our control have impelled us to alter both our national and our international policy. Our independence was won in conflict with Great Britain; yet since then Great Britain has proved our most reliable ally. In the past three decades, Italy and Japan have been first our associates and are now our enemies; and Soviet Russia, with whom for years after the last war we did not have even diplomatic relations, has become a valiant companion in arms. The impossibility of determining the acts of other nations should of itself commend to us the desirability of reconsidering from time to time the structure of all treaties.

The advisability of such a course is suggested also by our Constitution. Our Founding Fathers not only provided the means of changing the Constitution, but themselves made use of that machinery to add the Bill of Rights to our basic law. The elasticity of the document they shaped accounts for its success and permanence.

The fate of the League of Nations indicates that it might be wise not only to provide machinery for changing the peace structure, but also to make it *mandatory* that all nations reconsider the treaties at definite intervals. This was the intention of Lord Robert Cecil who, on behalf of the British delegation to the last Peace Conference, proposed that Article 19 of the Covenant of the League should state that "the Body of Delegates shall make provision for the periodic revision of treaties which have become obsolete and of international conditions the continuance of which may endanger the peace of the world."

Under this clause the members of the League would have been obligated at specific periods to survey legal, economic and social factors—such factors as helped produce this war. They would have been obligated to consider in orderly manner and in reasonable atmosphere such questions as those of the mandates and colon-

ies, of the Sudetenland, of Austria and Danzig. But the wording of Article 19 was changed so that instead of providing that the Assembly "*must* consider grievances," it read "*may* consider grievances." Then, when Bolivia and Chile sought to have the League settle their boundary dispute at the Second Assembly, it was eventually ruled that the League could not "of itself modify any treaty."

This time it should be recognized that the primary business of a peace system is to modify treaties when the necessity arises. More should be done than has ever been attempted heretofore to watch the development of disputes, grievances, conditions of any kind that are likely to cause trouble if not dealt with in time. To this end a permanent commission charged to study and report on the early symptoms of war might well be as organic a part of a peace structure as the international health section of the League. The Chile-Bolivia boundary case suggests that regional councils, if set up within an over-all world organization, might form a first court of appeal for disputes within the region.

The main difficulty will be in making governments accept revisions and modifications of the status quo in interest of world peace. Therefore I suggest that the United States (which played an important part in changing the wording of Article 19 from *must* to *may*) should accept its full responsibility and join with other nations in helping to solve these international problems, and that this time we support Lord Robert Cecil's vital proposal.

Most wars are made in violation of treaties. Even benign governments have abrogated contracts with their citizenry when changing events have suggested that the public interest lay in other directions. If we are seeking a lasting peace, let us be prepared to adapt our agreements to realities.

Peace is no less dynamic than war. To win it and to preserve it require a degree of sacrifice as great almost as that of battle.

The Fourth Pillar

FRANCIS B. SAYRE

The peace must proclaim the goal of autonomy for subject peoples, and it must establish international organization to assure and to supervise the realization of that end.

For the building of the coming peace one of the fundamental issues will be the problem of foreign rule over alien peoples. Shall the post-war world in Asia and in Africa be based upon nineteenth century patterns or must we look for something different?

The answer is clear. We are coming to see that the only possible foundation upon which a peace that will last can be built is that of Christian brotherhood; and this is as applicable to alien peoples as to home folks. Brotherhood allows no room for the exploitation of one people by another for the sake of selfish gain; it is incompatible with racial or national intolerance.

Ultimate autonomy for every subject race is the goal. "It has been our purpose in the past—and will remain our purpose in the future," declared Secretary Hull, "to use the full measure of our influence to support attainment of freedom by all peoples who, by their acts,

show themselves worthy of it and ready for it."

Clearly the problem of alien rule allows of no easy and quick solution. The way of peace does not lie through the grant of immediate independence to every subject people. When the United States assumed the responsibility of sovereignty over the Filipino people in 1898, an overnight grant of freedom to them would not have advanced the cause of peace. Our undertaking instead required the slow and arduous and baffling task of preparing the Filipino people for ultimate autonomy. For over forty years Americans have labored at that task. Insofar as we have succeeded, American ideals of liberty and democracy have gained a foothold in Asia and, we hope, solid groundwork has been laid there for stability and peace in the years to come.

What are the concrete directions in which we must move in the coming peace treaty in dealing with the problem of alien rule?

In the first place, the twentieth century method of approach must be fundamentally different from that of the past. The goal must be not exploitation for another country's profit, but the preparation of an underprivileged people for self-development and self-rule. This means a task infinitely more adventurous and more difficult than nineteenth century methods of imperialism. It means not how to extract natural wealth and trading profits from a backward people but how to build shoulder to shoulder with them schools and hospitals and roads and water systems, how to improve their public sanitation and to reduce their death rate, how to raise their general standard of living, and, above all, how to stimulate and inspire in them the ability and the desire to build for themselves.

In the second place, those undertaking the responsibility for alien rule in areas not yet ripe for self-government must work out with leaders of the subject race a forward-looking program, marking by definite steps the advance toward autonomy, and this program must be publicly declared. This involves progressively handing over to the subject people the responsibilities of government in one field after another; for the difficult art of self-government can be learned in no other way except by trial and error, costly as that may be. The acid test of sincerity will be the implementation of such declarations by concrete action, which cannot be too long delayed. The peace of the world depends upon this implementation.

In the third place, this progress toward autonomy must be subjected to international control, since the problem of alien rule is part of the problem of peace.

No single formula for international control can be worked out applicable to every area. Each presents a problem of its own. What we must achieve is an effective international control, exercised in such form as individual needs and conditions require.

In the fourth place, provision must be made at the coming peace conference for absolute equality of commercial opportunity in all areas subject to alien rule. Non-discrimination with respect to tariffs and all trade barriers would mean in the subject areas of the world the removal of fundamental causes of conflict and warfare. It would be an immense step forward. Ac-

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. McCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

DOROTHY CLEMENS, *Editorial Assistant*

companying these provisions looking toward economic freedom, steps should be taken to prevent economic strangleholds. Tariffs in subject areas must not be manipulated for the benefit of the ruling race. Neither must the winning of autonomy be frustrated by a growing economic dependence upon the ruling people.

In conclusion, we must not expect the problem of alien rule, which has torn the world for more than three centuries, to be mastered overnight. Neither will it be solved by mere machinery or organization. Doubtless the solution will come only gradually and almost imperceptibly as part of the incoming tide of new world brotherhood. "The world is growing ready again for adventure."

The Fifth Pillar

JOSEPH H. BALL

The peace must establish procedures for controlling military establishments everywhere.

There are several basic and deep-rooted causes of war. But the immediate cause of all of the great wars of modern times has been either aggression or fear of aggression. The majority of Christian nations wanting peace have been forced into armament races by a few nations whose power-hungry leaders were arming for conquest. The result has been a powder keg of heavily armed nations waiting only for the match of a border incident or a shift in alliances to explode into war. Procedures and machinery to free all nations, great and small, from the constant fear of aggression are essential to a lasting peace.

A system of collective security as implied in the Fifth Pillar, functioning under the United Nations political organization of the First Pillar, is the keystone of the

world peace structure. We must implement every one of the six pillars, but it would be futile to attempt the lengthy task of solving world economic problems, raising subject peoples to self-governing status and fostering education, intellectual and spiritual freedom throughout the world if it must be done in an international atmosphere of insecurity and fear, magnified by the terrifying and ever-increasing destructive force of modern war.

A workable system of international security is the first step toward permanent peace and is, furthermore, the only condition under which individual nations will even consider giving up the right to create unlimited armaments for national defense. Realistically, it is doubtful whether nations will give up that right until such a collective security system has proven that it can protect individual nations against aggression.

The overwhelming majority of individual citizens obey our laws without any coercion. Yet we recognize the need of policemen to control that minority who recognize no moral obligation to the community. Similarly, on the international level there must be some force to control those outlaw nations whose leaders recognize no moral obligation to the world community. No nation, however aggressive, will start a war against overwhelming odds. Therefore, a necessary corollary to real disarmament by nations must be the creation of an international military force sufficiently strong to stop aggression by such outlaw nations.

The United Nations should begin now organizing the peace. Disunity is already developing and as the day of victory nears and the pressure of immediate and common danger relaxes, that disunity is likely to increase rather than decrease.

With these facts in mind, two Democratic and two Republican Senators have introduced Senate Resolution 114, which urges our country to take the lead in forming now a United Nations organization to establish machinery for peaceful settlement of international disputes and to provide for the assembly of a United Nations military force to be used for the sole purpose of stopping future attempts at military aggression.

Announcing

a series of articles describing and interpreting recent developments among the Christians Churches in various lands, by foremost authorities:

JAPAN.....	Charles W. Iglehart
CHINA.....	M. Searle Bates
RUSSIA.....	Paul Anderson
GERMANY.....	Stewart W. Herman, Jr.
GREAT BRITAIN.....	Reinhold Niebuhr
THE WORLD CHURCH AND THE PEACE,	
John C. Bennett	

beginning in the issue of July 12th.

If our readers know of persons who would be interested in this series, we shall be grateful if they would send us their names and addresses.

Public Library
Woodward & Kirby Aves.
Detroit, Mich.

65C 1-44